

REMARKS

The Examiner's Office Action of October 22, 2002 has been received and its contents reviewed. Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the consideration given to the above-identified application.

By the above actions, claims 1, 19, 20, 36, 38, 54, 55, 71, 73, 80, 81, 88, 90, 97, and 98 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-104 are pending for consideration, of which claims 1, 19, 36, 54, 71, 80, 88, and 97 are independent. In view of these actions and the following remarks, reconsideration of this application is now requested.

Referring now to the detailed Office Action, claims 1-8, 19-25, 71-79, 80-87 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Lewis (U.S. Patent No. 5,589,847) in view of Suzuki (U.S. Patent No. 4,571,584). Further, claims 36-496, and 97-104 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Lewis in view of Suzuki and further in view of Akiyama et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,977,940 – hereafter Akiyama). Still further, claims 9, 26, 44, and 61 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Lewis in view of Friends et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,247,190 – hereafter Friends), and claims 10-18, 27-35, 45-53, and 62-70 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Lewis in view of Matsueda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,384,806).

A broad concept of the present invention is that each of storage circuits and each of D/A converter circuits are jointly owned by n (n is a natural number not less than 2) signal lines. According to the present invention, it is possible to decrease the number of the storage circuits and the number of the D/A converter circuits of the driver circuit to $1/n$ of that of the related art, as disclosed in the Summary of the Invention of the specification.

As amended, independent claims 1, 19, 36, 54, 71, 80, 88, and 97 further recite “the plurality of D/A converter circuits are lamp type D/A converter circuits”. Applicants respectfully assert that Lewis, Suzuki, Akiyama, and Matsueda do not teach or suggest the limitation of “the plurality of D/A converter circuits are lamp type D/A converter circuits”.

The requirements for establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, as detailed in MPEP § 2143 - 2143.03 (pages 2100-122 - 2100-136), are: first, there must be some suggestion or

motivation, either in the reference themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference to combine the teachings; second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success; and, finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. As none of the cited prior art references teach or suggest the limitation of "the plurality of D/A converter circuits are lamp type D/A converter circuits" recited in all the pending independent claims, their combination would not be proper.

In view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of all the pending rejections.

While the present application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, should the Examiner find some issue to remain unresolved, or should any new issues arise, which could be eliminated through discussions with applicants' representative, then the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone in order that the further prosecution of this application can thereby be expedited.

Lastly, it is noted that a separate Extension of Time Petition accompanies this response along with a check in payment of the requisite extension of time fee. However, should that petition become separated from this Amendment, then this Amendment should be construed as containing such a petition. Likewise, any overage or shortage in the required payment should be applied to Deposit Account No. 19-2380 (740819-488).

Respectfully submitted,



Luan C. Do
Registration No. 38,434

NIXON PEABODY LLP
8180 Greensboro Drive, Suite 800
McLean, VA 22102
(703) 770-9300